

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Kenneth D. Wright <KAW7777@aol.com>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Sun, Jan 24, 1999 5:13 PM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

98-120

Kenneth D. Wright (KAW7777@aol.com) writes:

Dear Chairman:

Heard new regulations might force cspan off of cable. Many of us use cspan to get our congressional info We depend on it. We have a right to be informed..

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 152.163.197.58
Remote IP address: 152.163.197.58

RECEIVED

FEB - 3 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARYNo. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

From: lawrence roese <vastrightwing@webtv.net>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Sun, Jan 24, 1999 8:49 AM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

98-120

lawrence roese (vastrightwing@webtv.net) writes:

C-SPAN NEEDS TO STAY AVAILABLE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE! WE DON'T NEED TWO CHANNELS OF THE SAME JUNK!!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 209.240.197.27
Remote IP address: 209.240.197.27

RECEIVED

FEB - 3 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

From: "Shirley Smith" <sansmith@gte.net> **EX PARTE OR LATE FILED**
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("journal@c-span.org")
Date: Fri, Jan 15, 1999 2:44 PM
Subject: C-SPAN2

98-120

You are always telling people to contact their cable company to get C-SPAN and/or C-SPAN2. That's a big joke for people in areas where there's a monopoly by one cable company.

Time Warner/Hillsborough County carries C-SPAN2 from the wee hours in the morning until 5:00 p.m. every weekday. At 5:00 p.m. they switch that channel to CNN/SI. I have taken your advice for two years now, contacting them and asking them to carry it full time, to no avail. I've asked friends to contact them also. This is particularly frustrating now that the "Trial" runs past 5:00 p.m. as it was when the Senate had a tie vote on the budget a few years ago and right before the vote was taken, we lost the C-SPAN2 signal.

Time Warner moved into the Tampa Bay area after the 1996 TeleCommunications Act was passed by Congress and proceeded to buy up all the smaller local cable companies, except one in St. Petersburg. I had been under the impression that the TeleCommunication Act was supposed to do away with monopolies, just the opposite happened. Now the only choice we have is between Time Warner cable or a satellite dish. In my case, I own a condo unit which has no windows facing the right direction for a satellite dish, so that's out of the question for me and the majority of the other 234 units in this condominium complex. We are stuck with Time Warner. So much for the TeleCommunications Act.

Time Warner also moved C-SPAN to a higher bandwidth (channel #73) which means that people with older TVs can't get it even tho they are paying for it as part of their package. My console in the living room is 5 years old and I can't get C-SPAN on it without turning on the VCR attached to it, and the picture quality leaves much to be desired. Thanks to Time Warner, I can't get something I'm paying for unless I go out and spend \$700-800 for a new console television. That's not easy for retirees on limited incomes, and I don't intend to do it until it becomes necessary since the one I have works fine and has a beautiful picture on the bandwidths below #65. In the meantime, I'm paying for something that's a part of the package the condo complex has a contract for, and can't get it.

Time Warner/Hillsborough County doesn't care about it's customers, why should they? they have a monopoly in this area. You either take what they provide or you don't get any cable TV. All this is thanks to Congress and the FCC.

Shirley Smith
Tampa, FL
sansmith@gte.net

CC: "Senator Bob Graham" <bob_graham@graham.senate.gov>

RECEIVED

FEB - 3 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: John Sullivan <splinter9@worldnet.att.net>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Wed, Jan 27, 1999 4:54 PM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

98-120

John Sullivan (splinter9@worldnet.att.net) writes:

I am vehemently opposed to the "must carry" concept which has become a part of the cable TV scene. In our area, we are forced to miss programming which is on one channel simply because it appears somewhere else on another channel. It is important to understand that what is on one channel may not be on another channel AT A WATCHABLE TIME! I must also speak in opposition to the now-considered digital second channel concept. This would force such viable and informative channels such as C-SPAN and C-SPAN 2 off many cable systems. My concern is that the American public has been educated by the programming on these channels to the point where the bureaucrats are beginning to worry. The impeachment hearings and trial bear that out. DO NOT LET THIS HAPPEN!!!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 12.79.210.118
Remote IP address: 12.79.210.118

RECEIVED
FEB - 3 1999
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: ania furnival <auntbanana@ns.summit.net>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Wed, Jan 20, 1999 9:20 PM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

98-120

ania furnival (auntbanana@mail.summit.net) writes:

your idea for "must carry" is just about the dumbest thing I have ever heard. What makes you think high - definition T.V. is such a wonderful thing anyway? Are you helping out the people that want to manufacture them? I saw this "marvel", and I am totally unimpressed; and will never buy one. And I have to give up C-Span for this pie in the sky? All I can figure is that you are all republicans that have invested money in this new technology.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 206.99.231.229
Remote IP address: 206.99.231.229

RECEIVED

FEB - 3 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

From: Michael Demus <Mikeldpro@aol.com>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Wed, Jan 20, 1999 11:43 PM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

018-120

Michael Demus (Mikeldpro@aol.com) writes:

I am opposed to the digital must carry rule that could take C-SPAN of my cable provider. C-SPAN is the most important channel on TV.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 152.163.194.178
Remote IP address: 152.163.194.178

RECEIVED

FEB - 3 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: "Brzezinski, Anthony J" <BrzezinsAJ@corning.com>
To: "psd@fcc.gov" <psd@fcc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 23, 1998 7:38 AM
Subject: Time Warner

98-120

Does Time Warner(in the Corning NY area) have the right to switch cable channels at their will? They have taken C-SPAN away and placed it on a channel I am not paying for, therefore I do not receive it now. They replaced it with WB, which I believe is Warner Brothers.

Thank you for your time.

Anthony J. Brzezinski
Desktop Support
Corning Incorporated
Brzezinsaj@corning.com
Voice: (607) 974-8043
Fax: (607) 974-5994

RECEIVED

JAN 27 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 0+1
List ABCDE